UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/559,679	12/06/2005	Thea Gladwin	P20854/DD	3747
23294 7590 05/21/2008 JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, P.C.			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 2266	EADS STATION		DOAN, ROBYN KIEU	
ARLINGTON, VA 22202			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3732	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/21/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/559,679	GLADWIN ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Robyn Doan	3732
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tid d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)☒ Th 3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pr	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 10 and 12-18 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr 5) Claim(s) 16-18 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 10 and 12-15 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and Application Papers	rawn from consideration.	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) according a constant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct of the specific part of the sp	ccepted or b) objected to by the e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat iority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	oate

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/11/08 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10, 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson (USP 1,977,920).

With regard to claim 10, Robinson discloses a hair clip (fig. 2) comprising two combs (10, 11) and at least one elastic member (20) resiliently to bias teeth (14) into an interleaved arrangement with one another (fig. 6, col. 2, line 58-62), each comb having opposite first and second surfaces (see fig. 3) whereby, when the teeth of the combs are interleaved from opposite directions (see fig. 6), some of the teeth of one comb overlaying and others underlaying the teeth of the other comb and such teeth being

biased towards one another, at least some of such overlaying and underlaying teeth interact with one another to form clamps for clamping hair between the two combs (col. 2, lines 78-97). Robinson fails to show the widths of the teeth of each comb being slightly wider than widths of spaces adjacent the teeth and the teeth of each comb having tapering sides on both surfaces and the teeth being substantially elliptical in cross-section. It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the widths of the teeth of each comb being slightly wider than widths of spaces adjacent the teeth and the teeth of each comb having tapering sides on both surfaces and the teeth being substantially elliptical in cross-section, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size and shape of the known component. A change in size and shape is generally recognized as being within the level or ordinary skill in the art. In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955). In regard to claims 12 and 13, Robinson shows the essential claimed invention except for the teeth having the substantially same width and the width of the teeth being about .5 to 2mm wider than the width of the spaces between the teeth. It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the teeth having the substantially same width and the width of the teeth being about .5 to 2mm wider than the width of the spaces between the teeth, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of the known component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level or ordinary skill in the art. In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955). In regard to claim 14, the combs being made of flexible material (col. 2, lines 63, 64).

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 10/559,679 Page 4

Art Unit: 3732

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson in view of Leslie (U.S. Design Pat. # D483,522).

With regard to claim 15, Robinson shows the essential claimed invention except for the elastic member having a plurality of beads threaded into the length of the elastic member. Leslie shows a hair device (fig. 1) comprising two combs connected to each other by a string of beads. It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the string of beads as taught by Leslie into the combs of Robinson in order to provide aesthetic look to the device.

Claims 16-18 are allowable over prior art of record.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's argument filed 6/15/2007 that the specific shape of the teeth and the size of the width of the teeth are not merely design choice but they provide a specific utilitarian function; however, Applicant is noted that the original disclosure has not disclosed the criticality of the specific shape of the teeth and the size of the width of the teeth, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill to try the specific shape and size of the teeth in order to improve the holding of the clip to the hair.

Conclusion

Application/Control Number: 10/559,679 Page 5

Art Unit: 3732

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robyn Doan whose telephone number is (571) 272-4711. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cris Rodriguez can be reached on (571) 272-4964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robyn Doan/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3732